DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 027 CG 013 084

AUTHOR Beatty, James R.
TITLE Judgment Analysis as an Experiential Facilitator in Adult Education Settings.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 78
NOTE 7p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (58th, San Francisco, California, April 19-22, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education Programs; *Adults; *Decision Making Skills; Educational Experience; Interaction Process Analysis; *Leadership Training; Peer Evaluation; Postsecondary Education; *Profile Evaluation; Program Descriptions; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The present paper describes the implementation of Judgment Analysis (JAN) as a useful experiential facilitator in the educational process. JAN first appeared in the literature in the early 1960's as a tool for capturing the decision-making policies of individuals. After individual policies are "captured," the process groups individuals into existing homogeneous groups which are heterogeneous to other existing groups. As an example of the use of JAN as an experiential tool in the learning process, adult participants in an executive development program were asked to make decisions regarding a number of applicants for positions within a large organization. The applicants' profiles contained various measures of personality, aptitude, achievement, and demographic data. After the policies of the students were "captured," students were given feedback as to which variables they were emphasizing in their decision-making process. They were also statistically grouped with other students who had similar policies, based on the JAN results. The students were then asked to compare their "captured" policies with the policies they perceived themselves as using and with policies of other students. The experiential exercise allows for exploration of decision policies, enhanced with personal involvement of participants. The process always generates enthusiasm and insights, and provides feedback to the students so that decisions can be monitored, evaluated, discussed, revised and re-evaluated. (Author/BN)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED165027

# Judgment Analysis as an Experiential Facilitator in Adult Education Settings

by

James R. Beatty

San Diego State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J R Beatty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Presented to the 1978 Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association

San Francisco, April 19-22, 1978

CG013084

Judgment Analysis as an Experiential Facilitator

in Adult Education Settings

Many continuing education courses designed to interest mature adults in advancing their knowledge in a given area have turned to the use of experiential education as a learning mode. Educators in such courses have recognized the necessity to develop active learners rather than passive listeners in the classroom situation (Beatty & Schneier, 1977). Such a pedagogical procedure often tends to increase interest and excitement among students since they have an opportunity to feel a sense of personal involvement in the teaching/learning situation (Finch, Jones, & Litterer, 1976; Kolb, Rubin, & McIntyre, 1974). In addition, the advantages of immediate feedback in the learning situation (Skinner, 1953) have long been known, and such feedback is generally enhanced through the use of experiences within the classroom.

The present discussion is concerned with the implementation of Judgment ANalysis (JAN) as a useful experiental facilitator in the educational process. JAN first appeared in the literature in the early 1960's as a tool for capturing the decision-making policies of individuals. After the individual policies were "captured," the process grouped individuals into existing homogeneous groups which were heterogeneous to other existing groups (Bottenberg & Christal, 1961, 1968; Christal, 1963, 1968a, 1968b). JAN has been applied to a variety of settings in an attempt to analyze such individual and group policies. For example, the procedure has been used to evaluate graduate school and doctoral program admissions (Houston, 1968; Roscoe & Houston, 1969), to evaluate supervisory policies (Naylor & Wherry, 1964), to specify military grade distributions (Christal, 1968b), to evaluate grade school effectiveness (Houston, Duff, & Roy, 1972), to examine student evaluations of faculty (Houston & Beatty, 1977), to capture

decision policies of learning disability specialists (Beatty, 1977), to understand the buying policies of consumers (Settle, Beatty, & Kaiser, 1977), and to evaluate works of art (Holmes & Zedeck, 1973).

Several variations of JAN have been described in the literature, including normative JAN, ipsative JAN, Type A JAN, and Type B JAN (Beatty, 1977). The most common of these procedures, based upon those reported in the literature, is normative, Type A JAN, which seems to have the most application for use in the classroom/laboratory experiential situation. Normative, Type A JAN refers to the technique whereby a set of persons functioning in an evaluation capacity are presented with profiles containing information concerning the individuals, products, organisms, concepts, etc., to be evaluated. The profiles usually consist of values on sets of variables which can be quantified. The evaluators indicate preferences among the individual profiles by rating the profiles in some manner on the basis of information available. Each of the evaluators examines the same set of profiles as does every other evaluator. Alternatives to normative, Type A JAN allow for use of subjective information and the use of different sets of profiles to be examined by different evaluators, but these methods have not been reported as widely in the literature.

As an example of the use of JAN as an experiental tool in the learning process, adult students in a certificate program in executive development participating in a learning module regarding personnel administration were asked to make decisions regarding a number of fictitious applicants for positions within a large organization. The students were given profiles on each of the applicants and were asked to differentiate among the applicants in regard to qualifications for the job. The profiles contained various measures of personality, aptitude, achievement, and demographic data. After the policies of the students were "captured," the students were given feedback as to which variables they were emphasizing in their decision-making process. They were also grouped with other

students who had similar policies, based on the JAN results. The students were then asked to compare their "captured" policies with the policies they perceived themselves as using. Correlations among the JAN policies and the perceived policies were obtained for each of the individuals. These students could then compare their policies with other members of their group, and the various "homogeneous" groups could compare their group policies with other groups not similar to theirs.

In learning modules similar to the one described above, correlations span the entire range of possible coefficients for captured and perceived policies. Such coefficients may indicate that the individuals knew what their policy was and followed the policy, did not know what their policy was, did not follow their perceived policy, did not have a policy, or had a complex nonlinear policy. The regression weights obtained through the model can then be used to illustrate what decision they may be predicted to make regarding new cases.

Students, after obtaining quantitative feedback, usually spend class time comparing their policies with the policies of other members of their group, with the policies of nonsimilar individuals and groups, and comparing their policies with some "ideal" decision-making policy. The instructor now has an opportunity to explore such decision-making policies, make presentations regarding the appropriateness and inappropriateness of various policies, and then repeat the process to determine change in policies after the learning situation and the follow-up presentation. The process always generates much enthusiasm and insights.

Other problems can be determined in the same manner; many situations which require the making of decisions regarding sets of individuals are appropriate for the application of JAN. The emphasis of the present discussion is that the tool can be used to do much more than simply capture policies. Much of its utility lies in its ability to provide feedback to the student so that decisions can be monitored, evaluated, discussed, revised, and re-evaluated.

References

Beatty, J. R. Identifying decision-making policies in the diagnosis of learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1977, 10, 201-209.

Beatty, R. W., & Schneier, C. E. Personnel administration: An experiential skill-building approach. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1977.

Bottenberg, R. A., & Christal, R. E. An iterative technique for clustering criteria which retains optimum predictive efficiency. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division. WADD-TN-61-30, ASTIA Document AD-261615, March 1961.

Bottenberg, R. A., & Christal, R. E. Grouping criteria--amethod which retains optimum predictive efficiency. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 34 (4), 28-34.

Christal, R. E. JAN: a technique for analyzing individual and group judgment. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division. PRL-TDR-63-3, ASTIA Document AD-403813, February 1963.

Christal, R. E. JAN: a technique for analyzing group judgment. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 36(4), 24-27.

Christal, R. E. Selecting a harem--and other applications of the policy-capturing model. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 36(4), 35-41.

Finch, F. E., Jones, H. R., & Litterer, J. A. Instructor's manual to accompany: Managing for organizational effectiveness: An experimental approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Holmes, G. P., & Zedeck, S. Judgment analysis for assessing paintings. Journal of Experimental Education, 1973, 41(4), 26-30.

Houston, S. R. Generating a projected criterion of graduate school success via normative judgment analysis. Journal of Experimental Education, 1968, 37(2), 53-58.

Houston, S. R., & Beatty, J. R. Student policies of teacher effectiveness. Journal of Teaching and Learning, 1977, 2, 23-33.

Houston, S. R., Duff, W. L., & Roy, M. R. Judgment analysis as a technique for evaluating school effectiveness. Journal of Experimental Education, 1972, 40(4), 56161.

Kolb, D. A., Rubin, I. M., & McIntyre, J. M. Organizational psychology: An experiential approach (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Naylor, J. C., & Wherry, R. J., Sr. Feasibility of distinguishing supervisors' policies in evaluation of subordinates by using ratings of simulated job incumbents. Lackland Air Force Base, Texas: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division. PRL-TR-64-25, ASTIA Document AD-610812, October 1964.

Roscoe, J. T., & Houston, S. R. Predictors of success in graduate education at Colorado State College. Colorado Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 8(2), 17-22.

Settle, R. B., Beatty, J. R., & Kaiser, J. V., Jr. Consumer judgment analysis. In B. A. Greenberg & D. N. Bellenger (Eds.), Contemporary marketing thought: 1977 educators' proceedings, series # 41. Chicago: American Marketing Association, 1977.

Skinner, B. F. Science and human behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1953.